

**Draft - Meeting Summary**  
**Rio Hondo Watershed Management Plan**  
**Project Advisory Committee Meeting #2**  
**July 2, 2003**

**MEETING OVERVIEW**

- The primary purpose of this second meeting of the Project Advisory Committee was to review the proposed Water Sampling Scope of Work. This draft document had been previously reviewed and refined by the Water Quality Subcommittee at a meeting on June 16. In addition to the proposed Water Quality Sampling Scope, PAC members were provided a written summary of the Water Quality Subcommittee meeting and a map identifying proposed sampling locations in the Rio Hondo Watershed.
- After addressing Water Quality Sampling, the PAC members also had questions regarding the overall Watershed Plan and received a brief presentation on the mapping process that is helping with the Watershed Existing Conditions Analysis.

**WATER QUALITY SAMPLING**

- The meeting began with an overview of the proposed Water Quality Sampling Scope by Eileen Takata from MIG. This was followed by a discussion facilitated by Daniel Iacofano.
- It was stated by Shirley Birosik from the Regional Water Quality Control Board – LA that a one time sampling event will not lead to new listings. She also stated that the State Regional Board has been looking at the process for listing and de-listings. A policy report from the State Regional Board is almost out, which will document the process for listing and de-listing TMDLs.
- The map of proposed sampling locations should be revised. Sample sub-drainages only at their confluences with the Rio Hondo.
- Gerald Greene from the City of Downy stated the proposed water sampling scope reflected a generally correct approach. However, there was still concern of TMDL's being created from one sampling event, even just a snapshot. In contrast, it takes a year of samplings to be de-listed.
- It would be great if we had correspondence from the Regional Board assuring us that if we find something it won't come back to bite us later.

- A sampling event is not rigorous enough to provide a complete picture of water quality. It is only one input. Cannot generalize from one sample at one time to the whole watershed.
- The watershed management plan will not be based on this sample. The final watershed plan will include recommendations for more complete sampling.
- If we were not doing this (the water quality sampling), then who would be doing it? - No one, the Watershed Plan would rely on existing data.
- Still nervous about doing this since there could be multi-billions of dollars in question.
- It was stated by one stakeholder that while it was important to be concerned about the regulations, at the same time we don't want to lose the focus on water quality.
- An acute toxicity test with bad results is the only one time event that could remotely trigger a TMDL listing. The proposed water quality sampling scope is not sampling for toxicity events.
- The proposed scope is testing constituents based on the 303d listing. Are there constituents that are not listed but are coming up?
- The proposed methodology minimizes the risks to the cities. If we put it in writing and all parties agree to it, including the Regional Board, then the sampling event won't come back to haunt us at a later time. The bottom-line is that we need an agreement from the Regional Board that they buy-off on this methodology.
- If the grantor is requiring that we do this, then we need to move beyond this. Instead, it is important that we focus on the overall goals and strategies of this Plan.
- We are better off doing this as a group, rather than individually. Our data points should be pooled with other monitoring events.
- Sampling standards should be the same for all. Instead, there is a higher standard to de-list, than being placed on the list in the first place.
- Once the water quality control policy document comes out, the process will be clearer than it has been before.
- It is very helpful and important for the Regional Board (Shirley Birosik) to be at all the PAC meetings.
- Existing water quality sampling data for the Rio Hondo is from the late 80's and early 90's. It provides more of a historic timeline that is outside the window of the

TMDLs. If there is anything significantly different from this historic baseline ( a sampling data spike), then we will go back to resample.

- All the water quality sampling data (both existing and from the sampling event) will be brought back to the PAC for their review.
- The sampling event included in this project contract was proposed by the COG and the RMC and was not required by the Regional Board.
- DPW will carry out the sampling event with one-weeks notice.
- What is the minimum number of sampling events required for a listing? What is in the de-listing document? What is the listing process by which constituents will be listed?
- When the approved draft water quality control policy is released it will be circulated to the PAC.
- It was also agreed that the PAC will send a letter to Dennis Dickerson of the Regional Board addressing the concerns of the PAC requesting clarification from the Regional Board. The sampling event can be done in parallel with the letter as it will take time to get a response from the Regional Board.
- It was pointed out that we are better off with a one-time event versus volunteers going out there five times in a year. This approach gives us more control over the situation.

#### **WATERSHED PLAN QUESTION AND ANSWER**

- Since a significant amount of flows is from imported water coming into the Rio Hondo for recharge, I assume the sampling event will not be affected by this imported water?
  - LA County Sanitation District releases water in the Rio Hondo
  - Requested that Gary Hildebrand from LA Count DPW provide a presentation to the PAC describing the Rio Hondo system.
- Which beneficial uses are appropriate?
  - Rec-1 needs further study.
- When will existing data analysis be done? The Chambers Group will conduct the data analysis. A summary of the results from this analysis will be provided for the next PAC meeting and the Water Quality Subcommittee will review it.

#### **MAPPING/EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS**

- Eileen Takata reviewed the GIS Map Production Matrix. It lists the various maps under development that will be used to draw conclusions and provide input into the

Watershed Management Plan. Bobby Cochran from the Rivers and Mountains Conservancy presented 15 maps that have already been completed to aid existing conditions analysis. Some of the comments and questions included:

- Map 4-A: Biking, Hiking, Equestrian Trails – Are you able to distinguish these different types of trails? – The map features Class I Bikeways, mountain trails, and trail information provided by LA County Parks and Recreation. Trail information from individual cities is not yet available.
- Maps 2-C: Groundwater and 2-D: Water Supply Opportunities – what is the information source for these maps? - Possible sources could be:
  - San Gabriel Valley Water Quality Authority
  - San Gabriel Municipal Water District
- Map 3-C: Storm Drains should be a part of Map 1-A: Flood Control & Water Diversion Structures
- What happened to Map 2-A? – It is not relevant to this project. This matrix was derived from San Gabriel River project, therefore maps will be re-numbered for Rio Hondo.
- How will the maps be made available to the PAC? – these maps will all be featured in the report and can be posted on a website.
- Map 6-F: Habitat Restoration and Connectivity Opportunities – This map not feasible as the relevant studies are not available to draw upon. Other potential information sources to draw upon:
  - Common Ground report
  - U. S. Forest Service, Audobon Society (bird count)
  - US Fish and Wildlife, California Department Fish and Game
- There should be more emphasis placed on this area (habitat restoration). The RMC is conducting a more detailed habitat study for the whole area.
- It will be important to identify known concentrations of Arundo
- Should we include the Department of Health Services in these meetings, as especially there may be conflicting objectives. The WRD wants to use all available reclaimed water for recharge beyond the current 50,000 AFY cap.
- Are there any water reclamation plants in the Rio Hondo watershed?
  - The Whittier Narrows Reclamation Plant is not in the watershed, but it returns water to it (discharges to Legg Lake and Zone 1 Ditch)
  - Opportunities to recharge reclaimed water into groundwater?